

## **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 3, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **I. Abstract Objections**

The abstract has been objected to for containing legal terminology. In response to the objection, Applicant has amended the abstract to remove such terminology. In view of that amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the abstract is not objectionable, and therefore respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

### **II. Claim Objections**

Claim 4 has been objected to for containing the term "designer location". In particular, it is alleged that the term should read "print service provider location".

In response to the objection, Applicant notes that the term "designer location" is correct. Support for that limitation can be found in Applicant's specification in paragraph 0034.

### **III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 6-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter.

In response, Applicant has amended remaining claims 6 and 8-10 to recite a "computer-readable medium". Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 8-10 are

now directed to statutory subject matter as defined by 35 U.S.C. § 101 (e.g., a “manufacture”) and therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Laverty, et al.* (“Laverty,” U.S. Pat. No. 6,429,947). Applicant respectfully traverses.

As indicated above, each remaining independent claim has been amended through this Response. In view of the amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding the merits of the claims, Applicant notes that Laverty at least does not teach “creating a job ticket at the designer location that specifies production devices of the print service provider to be used to process said print job and processing instructions for the print service provider location”, “an automated preflight module at the designer location automatically establishing a link to the print service provider location and obtaining updated device configuration information from the print service provider location concerning the production devices specified in said job ticket”, “the automated preflight module automatically performing an automated remote proofing by (i) comparing said job ticket with the obtained device configuration information to determine whether all required elements for successful processing of said print job are present and (ii) checking said print job and said job ticket for errors”, or “generating at the designer location a press ready file that encapsulates both said print job and said job ticket”.

**V. Canceled Claims**

Claims 7 and 11 have been canceled from the application without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequently.

**VI. New Claims**

Claims 12-15 have been added into the application through this Response. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims describe an invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully requests that these claims be held to be allowable.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



---

David R. Risley  
Registration No. 39,345